

337.5
148315s

Lincoln Room

SPEECH

OF

EDW. JOY MORRIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN

DEFENCE OF THE TARIFF OF 1842,

AND THE

PROTECTIVE POLICY AND AMERICAN LABOR.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, APRIL 24, 1844.

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE WHIG STANDARD.

1844.

S P E E C H .

MR. SPEAKER: If there ever was a law imperatively called for by the necessities of the country, it was the Tariff act of 1842. When the 27th Congress met in Extra Session, in the summer of 1842, the country presented a scene of distress to which even the most disastrous periods of our history furnish an inadequate parallel. Not only had the active operations of trade ceased, and the pursuits of all classes of the people become embarrassed, but the Government itself was sinking beneath the weight of an increasing debt, which it had no resources to arrest or extinguish.

ORIGIN OF THE TARIFF OF 1842.

In the eight years of the Administration of General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren, from 1831 to 1839, there was an excess of imports over exports of \$235,278,605. During these eight years \$263,708,033 of imports were admitted duty free, being three millions more than half of the whole importation. In these years, also, there was an excess of expenditure over income of \$28,577,545 48; and, upon the assembling of the 27th Congress, there was a public debt of \$18,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his report at the Extra Session of 1842, estimated the deficit for the current financial year at \$14,000,000. The stock of the Federal Government was selling below par, and the Secretary of the Treasury in vain endeavored to negotiate a new loan. The credit of the Government was at such a low ebb that no capitalist was willing to risk an investment in its stock. Such was the wretched condition to which a false and destructive policy had reduced the Government and the people. There was no longer any excuse for delay in adopting measures of remedial legislation. The Government wanted money and the people relief from bankruptcy.

Beyond the immediate wants of the Federal Government, there was a vast manufacturing capital which had grown up under the Tariff system which needed protection against the excessive importations that were crushing all branches of American industry. The paper manufacture, with its six hundred paper mills, employing a capital of \$16,000,000, and producing about that amount, and affording support to fifty thousand persons, required protection against the cheap labor of France, Germany, and Italy. The cotton manufacture, which has grown up since 1816, and which now consumes three hundred thousand bales of cotton, and employs a capital of \$25,000,000, and turns out, annually, one hundred and fifty millions yards, of the value of \$16,000,000, also deserved the fostering care of Government.

The wool growers—an interest owning twenty millions of sheep, of the value of \$40,000,000, whose product amounts to fifty millions of pounds, the investment of which is estimated at \$125,000,000, also justly claimed the consideration of an *American Congress*.

The sugar interest of Louisiana, producing annually seventy millions of pounds—the leather and shoe business, whose annual production is valued at \$50,000,000, and which employs one hundred thousand persons—the great iron interest, whose annual yield rises to \$25,000,000, and which employs 51,405 laborers, to whom it yearly pays the sum of \$18,762,990 in wages—the salt manufacture, with its capital of \$6,998,045, and the grand aggregate capital of \$400,000,000 invested in mining—the mechanic arts and manufactures—were all submitted to the guardian care of the Congress of 1842. That body would have been faithless to its high trusts—false to all the impulses of patriotic duty—and criminally reckless of the welfare of the American people, had it sacrificed this vast amount of American capital to the delusive theories of Free Trade, by refusing to it that system of protective duties under which it had grown up and developed its vast powers of production.

It was with a view to sustain these great interests, to which the community had been invited by the policy recommended by Washington, and pursued since the foundation of the Government, and to rescue the national credit from dishonor, and to provide means for the payment of the public debt, that the Tariff act of 1842 was passed. This act was framed with the purpose of meeting all these objects. The beneficial effects of this redeeming measure are in the highest degree creditable to the sagacity,

foresight, and enlightened patriotism of its projectors—the Whig Congress of 1842. Let it stand untouched—suffer it to continue its work of regeneration—and we shall again the the country restored to prosperity, and every vestage of national debt swept away.

INJURIOUS EFFECTS OF THE NEW TARIFF.

I am opposed to any change in the present Tariff, until we have practical evidence of the evils which its enemies predict of it. Several of the proposed modifications, in the bill before the House, will have a disastrous influence upon certain manufactures, and may utterly destroy them. I refer to its effects on paper, the annual production of which amounts to two millions of dollars, consuming two hundred millions of pounds of rags, of which one hundred and fifty millions of pounds are furnished from this country. The present duty on paper is about 40 per cent. on the best quality—the duty proposed, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

As the French laws prohibit the exportation of rags, and as labor in that country is cheaper than in America by about four-fifths, the American workman receiving a dollar for that for which the Frenchman is paid twenty cents, it follows, of course, that paper can be produced more cheaply in France than in this country. Under the proposed rates of duty, French paper could be sold in this country at an average of ten cents, which would drive the American at twelve and a half cents out of the market. Under this new duty of 30 per cent., German paper could be sold here at \$2.27½ per ream, while the American costs \$2.75. With the entire command that these low prices would give the French and Germans of our markets, the American manufacture would be destroyed.

Pass this bill, and you will, indeed, reduce the price of paper, but will this be any compensation for the destruction of so much American capital, for the annihilation of a branch of industry yearly increasing in production and value, and which engages in its operations so many thousands of our population? Pass this bill, and you will enrich the manufacturers of Italy, France, and Germany; but you will destroy sixteen millions of domestic capital, you will deprive fifty thousand persons and their dependant families of the means of honest livelihood, and you will render this country dependant for the material by which the Press scatters its light among the people, upon the capricious and unstable supply of foreign manufacturers.

The injurious effects of Free Trade are very plainly demonstrated in the iron manufacture. From 1833 to 1842, during which period railroad iron was imported free of duty, the price was kept up at a high rate, having risen from \$34.37 per ton in 1832, to \$59.37 in 1840. After 1840, the demand ceased from this country and the price fell. In 1844, with \$25 duty per ton, the price is \$23.12. The high price of railroad iron, while it was admitted duty free, proves that, in a period of Free Trade, we are entirely at the mercy of the foreign manufacturer; and its reduction, under heavy duties, sustains the oft-asserted fact, that the duty, for the most part, falls on the producer and not the consumer.

In this interval of Free Trade, prices were kept at such rates as the English manufacturers chose. When over-production was apprehended, or the spirit of competition had overstocked the market, resolutions were passed by the ironmasters to blow out their furnaces, and thus reduce the quantity. In the English Mining Journal of January 31, 1839, we are informed that “the present state of the iron trade is very encouraging—that the wise measures which the ironmasters adopted last year, (when the demand gradually fell off in consequence of the state of affairs in America,) prevented any great reduction in the price of iron, for, by passing resolutions to blow out their furnaces, and thus reduce their make, a much healthier state of the iron trade was secured than could by possibility otherwise have been expected; and upon the resumption of American business, prices generally rose to their present very satisfactory height, 50 common bar.” This extract shows the combinations resorted to in order to fleece the American consumer for the benefit of the British producer.

I am, sir, in favor of retaining the duty on railroad iron as it stands, because it keeps down the price of the foreign article, and because it affords sufficient protection to enable the American manufacturer to produce an article of as good quality and at a fair profit. Under the Tariff of 1842 there have been erected, at great expense, in Pennsylvania, several furnaces for the manufacture of railroad iron by anthracite and bituminous coal. Although not a ton of T rail has yet been made in this country, there is no doubt whatever of the complete success of these new establishments, and that they will be able to furnish a fabric of as good quality as the English, at \$55 per ton.

The duty in the present Tariff was laid to establish and encourage this new manufacture. If it is suffered to remain, it will create a large amount of new capital, and add another branch of industry to the national production.

The heavy importations of iron have contributed to that excessive exportation of specie from this country which produced the recent embarrassments in trade and the derangement of the currency. As no encouragement was afforded for the manufacture of railroad iron in this country by the Tariffs anterior to 1842, our railroads were laid entirely with British rail. We have now about eight thousand miles of railroads, each mile of which requires seventy tons; taking \$50 per ton as the average price, each mile would cost \$3,500, and the whole would amount to \$28,000,000! Every dollar of this twenty-eight millions has been expended out of the country, while we possessed the material and skill to make the same article at home! Instead of encouraging the domestic manufacture, the Government has crushed every effort in its incipient stages. In 1832, four forges were erected for producing railroad iron, but they had no sooner commenced operations than they were forced, by the suicidal policy of the Government, to extinguish their fires. The duties in the Tariff of 1842 were imposed to arrest the ruinous drain of the precious metals caused by the immense purchases of British iron, and to build up a home production. If they continue unchanged, we shall soon see our railroads laid with American iron.

It will not be pretended that the countrymen of Fulton and Whitney have not sufficient ingenuity and skill to manufacture railroad iron. Already our infant nation has taught the kingdoms of the old world the power of steam and the mode of applying it to navigation. The improvements in machinery and in the processes of manufacture in this country, keep pace with those of the most enlightened nation of Europe. In the progress of half a century, mechanical skill and intellectual power have made developments in the United States which surpass some of the proudest achievements of England in her long career of glory.

The American traveller in Europe will find just cause for patriotic pride in seeing American locomotives upon the railroads of Prussia, Austria, and Russia. While most of the European nations import their locomotives and steamboat machinery from England, and the Adriatic and Mediterranean are traversed by steamboats of English construction, bearing the Austrian, French, and Ottoman flags, such has been the superior progress of our countrymen in all that relates to the application of steam, that American locomotives are now used upon some of the *English* railroads. On the great Manchester road there is an engine, the product of Philadelphia skill, which, in its power of draught, speed, and strength, has not as yet been equalled by British ingenuity. Why is it then, with so many evidences of American success in manufactures and the arts, under a system of prudent protection, that encouragement should not be given to the production of one of the most important of iron fabrics? Why should we be dependant on foreign countries for an article, the raw material of which exists in such abundance in the mountain ranges that traverse the States of the Union, and where it lies side by side with the inexhaustible beds of the mineral which is to render it pliable to the hand of the forgesmith? No gentleman on this floor will be bold enough to assert that the manufacture of railroad iron is beyond the capacity of his countrymen. Unless this be established, there cannot be any reason whatever for a repeal of the present duties, until the experiment be fairly tested.

The duty on railroad iron is not, as has been asserted, out of proportion to the rates on other articles. By comparing the protection afforded to the sugar planter and the iron maker, it will be seen that there is a large difference in favor of the former:

1842.—IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES.

				<i>U. S. duties.</i>	<i>Ad valorem duty.</i>
TONS OF IRON,	99,804	cost	\$3,390,000	\$2,039,943	60 per cent.
TONS OF SUGAR,	69,382	cost	\$5,434,750		
Off for box and hhd.	-	-	1,000,000		
			<hr/>		
			\$4,434,750	\$3,900,000	90 per cent.

Or, in other words, the duty on Sugar is \$56 per ton, and on Railroad Iron \$25 per ton.

From this calculation, it will be seen that the sugar planter of Louisiana has a protection of 30 per cent. ad valorem more than the iron manufacturers; and that to make them equal under the Tariff of 1842, the duty on raw brown sugar should be restored to \$2 per one hundred pounds. The South has no reason to complain of the existing Tariff as oppressive and burdensome, and too partial to the Northern manufacturer, with such duties on sugar, an article exclusively of Southern production.

Had I, Mr. Speaker, no other motive for opposing the new Tariff, I should find ample reason in the inquisitorial tyranny with which it searches out the smallest manufactures as objects of its vindictive attacks. The humbler pursuits which require small capitals, and afford employment to great numbers of industrious mechanics, will be deprived of any protection, by the proposed duties, sufficient to sustain them against the overwhelming competition of foreign labor. I never could have supposed that a party, assuming to itself exclusively the attributes of Democracy, and professing such a high regard for the interests of the mechanic, would have reported a bill waging such disastrous war upon the blacksmith, the shoemaker, the hand-loom weaver, the sempstress, the tailor, and the hatter.

The duties on ready-made clothing, a manufacture which employs many hundred persons, male and female, in the district which I have the honor to represent, are to be reduced from 50 per cent. to 30 per cent.; the value to be settled by the importer, whose interest it is to depreciate as much as possible the real value of the article. This reduction will be ruinous to the American workman, who, under its operation, will soon be driven out of market and out of work, by the refuse stocks of English and French manufacture thrown into this country in such quantities as to break down our domestic establishments.

The duty on boots and bootees is to be reduced to 30 per cent.; a duty which will again, as in past years, overstock the market with excessive importations from France, and cause a great loss of profit to the American shoemaker. With the depression of business that this starving rate of duty will produce, there will follow a ruinous reduction of wages among the journeymen shoemakers—a class of mechanics whose labor is of the severest kind, and eminently deserving of a liberal remuneration. I should deem myself false to every obligation of duty to my constituents, and neglectful of their interests, did I not protest in the most solemn manner against this attack upon one of their means of livelihood, and this open sacrifice of one of the most important branches of American industry.

The following table will further illustrate the effects of this new Tariff upon mechanics:

NAMES OF ARTICLES. <i>Effect upon Mechanics.</i>	PRESENT DUTY. <i>Per cent.</i>	PROPOSED DUTY. <i>Per cent.</i>
Mits, caps, binding, and hosiery, - - - - -	30	20
Umbrellas, parasols, and sun shades, - - - - -	30	25
Silk hats, bonnets, &c. - - - - -	55	25
Hat bodies, - - - - -	43	30
Hats and bonnets of vegetable substances, - - - - -	35	25
India rubber shoes, - - - - -	30	20
Clocks, - - - - -	30	20
Untarred cordage, - - - - -	188	30
Iron cables and chains, - - - - -	80	30
Cut and wrought spikes, - - - - -	82	30
Cut nails, - - - - -	43	30
Brass kettles, (hammered,) - - - - -	43	30
Japanned, plated, and gilt ware, - - - - -	30	25
Cutlery of all kinds, - - - - -	30	25
Sole leather, - - - - -	53	25
Calf skins, - - - - -	37	25
Bricks and paving tiles, - - - - -	25	15
Metal buttons, - - - - -	30	25
Hard soap, - - - - -	51	30
China ware, - - - - -	30	20

From a review of this table, it would be supposed that the Committee of Ways and Means had drawn up their bill expressly for the benefit of the foreign mechanic, and that in their opinion it would be much better to supply ourselves with cheap foreign importations than to support the American laborer. To every manufacture, which has made much progress in Great Britain, the products of which are now poured into all the markets of the world, the committee evince a strong partiality. For the sake of encouraging the consumption of foreign fabrics, the duty on coarse cottons is reduced from 120 per cent. to 30 per cent.; on woollen fabrics, from 40 to 30 per cent.; on carpetings, treble grain, from 87 to 30 per cent.; on cotton bagging, from 53 to 30 per cent.; on oil cloths, from 30 to 10 per cent.; on window glass, 8 by 10, from 62 to 30 per cent.; on 12 by 16, from 165 to 30 per cent.; on gunpowder, from 51 to 30 per cent.; on pins, from 53 and 59 to 30 per cent.; on manufactured rolled iron, from \$25 to \$20 per ton; anchors, from 44 to 30 per cent.; iron cast vessels, from 45 to 30 per cent.; pig iron, from 76 to 56 per cent.; on lead, in pigs, from 66 to 30 per cent., &c.

By the proposed reduction of the duties on woollen cloths to 25 per cent., the American manufacturer will pay on his wool precisely the same duty which the English manufacturer pays on his cloth exported to this country.

The woollen manufacture requires encouragement, and cannot well flourish under a lower rate of protection. In coarse woollens we have, since 1815, made such progress as to supply the home demand at fair prices, and to ship considerable quantities to foreign countries. In the finer articles of woollen manufacture, the English, French, and Germans, still successfully compete with us. Should the present duties be continued for a period of years, American broadcloths will be produced of equal quality with the best fabrics of foreign looms. The importation of woollen manufactures in 1836 was \$21,080,003, and in 1842, \$8,375,725, less \$12,704,728—a diminution which very clearly indicates the progress of the home manufacture under the fostering influence of protective duties.

These reductions sufficiently demonstrate the anti-American tendencies of this new bill—a bill which, if rumor be credible, was framed in accordance with the views of the British importers, whom the Committee called to their counsels, to the exclusion of the American merchant, whose unyielding patriotism had no suggestions to make of measures inimical to the well-being of his country and the prosperity of his fellow-citizens.

FREE TRADE AND PROTECTION COMPARED.

The 12th section of the Tariff bill before the House declares that all ad valorem duties, exceeding 25 per cent., shall be reduced to that rate on and after September 1, 1845. Twenty-five per cent. is the maximum of protection the committee can afford, no matter how necessary a higher duty may be to the support of certain manufactures, and to the preservation of a just balance of trade. The committee regard protection as a mere *accidental* question, that may be disregarded without any public detriment. Revenue, I admit, ought to be the leading principle in the formation of any Tariff. Next to revenue, however, the adjustment of the Tariff, so as to prevent a constant drain of specie—to guard against a frequent excess of imports over exports, and to preserve a fair equality of trade—is a consideration of the highest importance.

How is this object to be attained, but by the encouragement of domestic manufactures, which, contributing to the supply of the wants of our population, will obviate the dangers of large imports? The development of American industry, the creation of capital to carry on its operations, the stimulus that it gives to trade, the distribution of wealth and comfort that it promotes, deserve the attention of every statesman who desires to see this country prosperous, rich, and independent. Without protection—with Free Trade in full operation from 1789 to the present time, what would have been the condition of the United States? What was our colonial history under this system? The Colonies were not allowed by Great Britain to engage in any manufactures; their trade which, by certain arbitrary laws, was chiefly confined to the mother country, consisted in the exchange of raw products for manufactured goods. I need not refer to the tyrannical edicts by which all attempts at establishing manufactures in the Colonies were suppressed, or to the declaration of Lord Chatham, that he did not wish to see America able even to manufacture a hob nail. The hostility of England to American industry, was one of the list of grievances that drove our ancestors to the Revolutionary war of freedom—a war alike for personal liberty, and commercial and manufacturing independence.

What the history of the Colonies was under this system, would have been ours had it existed to the present day. Then, as in recent times, when in operation, it drained the country of the precious metals, left it without any metallic basis for its currency, and kept it poor and dependant. “Those that are acquainted with America know, as I do,” said Capt Luttrell, in a debate in Parliament, “that from Rhode Island, northwards, *they have no money*; that their trade is generally carried on by barter, from the most opulent merchant to the most necessitous husbandman. Sir, before your fleets and armies visited their coasts, you might almost as soon have raised the dead as one hundred pounds in specie from any individual in these provinces.” We have witnessed similar results, whenever the principles of Free Trade have been introduced into the Tariff. In the three years preceding 1818, it produced an excess of imports over exports of \$75,000,000, leaving a balance of trade against the U. States of \$25,000,000 annually. The \$70,000,000 of excess of imports from 1836 to 1839, and the scarcity of specie during that period, were the natural fruits of this self-sacrificing policy.

The history of Portugal furnishes an illustration of the pernicious effects of the ab-

sence of protective duties, as disastrous as that of the American Colonies. In the year 1681, the woollen manufacture was established in Portugal, and flourished so successfully that both Portugal and Brazil were entirely supplied with its fabrics, the raw material for which was wholly drawn from Spain and Portugal. In 1684, the importation of all foreign woollen cloths was prohibited. Under this system Portugal was a flourishing kingdom, with the balance of trade in her favor, and exporting largely to other countries. In 1703 a treaty was concluded with Great Britain, by which it was stipulated that English woollen fabrics should not be subject to a higher duty than 23 per cent. In the very first year of this treaty, Portugal was deluged with English woollens, and the balance of trade turned against her. Previous to this treaty, the coins of Portugal were rarely seen in England. After it had taken effect, there was an annual balance in favor of England of \$4,444,000. "During the twenty years prohibition," says an English writer, "the Portuguese succeeded so well in their woollen manufactures, that we brought thence no gold nor silver; but after the taking off that prohibition, we brought away so much of their silver as to leave them very little for *their necessary occasions*, and then we began to bring away their gold. Before the treaty, not such a thing as a Portugal piece was seen in England; or, if it was, it was almost as great a curiosity as our medals."

In contrast with this short-sighted legislation, let me refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the uniform policy of England from the time of Edward III, when she brought her woollen manufacture into existence, under prohibitory duties, down to more modern times. I shall not run down the long line of her history to trace her adherence to the protective system—it is too well known to require extended comment. The defence of her industry against East India fabrics, will illustrate it sufficiently for my purpose. In 1787 she had \$5,000,000 invested in cotton manufacture, which was yielding a profitable return on the outlay, and a large annual product. The prosperity of this business was suddenly checked by the importations of East India cotton goods, which were sold at 20 per cent. less than the British. Did England, on this occasion, practically adopt the maxim of her great apostle of Free Trade? "If a foreign country can supply us with a commodity cheaper than we ourselves can make it, better buy of them." No, sir, an act of Parliament was immediately passed imposing a duty of fifty pounds for every hundred pounds of the true value of East India cotton manufactures, according to the gross price at which goods were sold at the public sales of the company trading to the East Indies. In 1798 this duty was increased to £122 4s. 5d. for every hundred pounds of the original cost—a duty virtually prohibitory. The effects of this self-defensive legislation are visible in the great capital of \$175,000,000 invested in cotton manufacture, and in its rapid progress from 1764, when the imports of cotton wool did not amount to four millions of pounds, whereas they now exceed the prodigious amount of four hundred and fifty millions of pounds.

The effect of Free Trade upon British India is seen in the decay of all branches of her industry. This melancholy picture is thus sketched in Blackwood:

"It is the boast of our manufacturers—and such a marvel may well afford a subject for exultation—that with cotton which grew on the banks of the Ganges, they can, by the aid of British capital, machinery, and enterprise, undersell, in the production of muslin and cotton goods, the native Indian manufacturers, who work up their fabrics in the close vicinity of the original cotton fields. The constant and increasing export of British goods to India, two-thirds of which are cotton, demonstrates that this superiority really exists; and that the muslin manufacturers in Hindostan, who work for 3d. a day on their own cotton, cannot stand the competition of the British operatives, who receive 3s. 6d. a day, aided as they are by the almost miraculous powers of the steam-engine. Free trade, therefore, is ruinous to the manufacturing interests of India; and, accordingly, the Parliamentary proceedings are filled with evidence of the extreme misery which has been brought on the native manufacturers of Hindostan by that free importation of British goods, in which our political economists so much and so fully exult."

Contrast this example of the destructive influences of Free Trade with the auspicious effects of protection. When Frederick the Great ascended the throne of Prussia, that kingdom had no manufactures and no national industry, and was as poor in resources as it was weak in military power. Of the pitch to which this warrior king carried the military glory of Prussia, it is not in place here to speak. He encouraged manufactures in every possible manner by bounties, loans, premiums, &c., and not only trebled the number of manufacturers, but established many new manufactures, and broke the shackles of Prussian vassalage. The sequel of this patriotic and benign legislation is told in the following paragraph from a historian of the reign of Frederick:

"Before the commencement of this reign, Prussia had but few manufactures; now we are in possession of almost every possible kind of manufacture, and we can, not only supply the Prussian dominions,

but also furnish the remote counties of Spain and Italy with linen and woollen cloths; and our manufactures go even to China, where some of our Silesian cloths are conveyed by way of Russia. We export, every year, linen cloth to the amount of six millions of crowns, and woollen cloths and wool to the amount of four millions."

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. OWEN) denounces the protective system as the British system. If he means that it deserves the appellation from the benefits it has conferred on Great Britain, I agree with him in the justness of the term; but if he means that it has been exclusively adopted in that country, he is wrong. Protection of domestic industry has been the cardinal principle of every civilized nation, and their prosperity has been in proportion to the care they have taken of their manufacturing interests. France, Holland, Prussia, Austria, and Russia, have all built up their manufactures under the influence of protective duties. Free Trade is the policy of savage nations unacquainted with the rudiments of civilization—Protection that of enlightened communities, jealous of their independence and prosperity. The theory of Free Trade forms an appropriate theme for abstract philosophers, who puzzle their metaphysical brains with speculations as intricate as the cobwebs that cover their dusty chambers. Protection is the doctrine of practical statesmen, who have to deal with the stern realities of life, and the great interests of human societies. The theories of Adam Smith have never been reduced to practice in the country of his birth. They continue to be as zealously expounded as ever to foreign nations; the reason is very candidly stated in the March number of Blackwood. This ingenuous confession ought to teach us the utter fallacy of these plausible doctrines:

"It is related of the Lacedemonians, that, while all the other citizens of Greece were careful to surround their towns with walls, they alone left a part open on all sides. Thus, superiority in the field rendered them indifferent to the adventitious protection of ramparts. It is for a similar reason that England is now willing to throw down the barriers of tariffs, and the impediments of custom-houses, and that all other nations are fain to raise them up. It is a secret sense of superiority on the one side, and of inferiority on the other, which is the cause of the difference. We advocate freedom of trade, *because we are conscious that, in a fair unrestricted competition, we should succeed in beating them out of their own market.* They resist it, and loudly clamor for protection, because they are aware that such a result would speedily take place, and that the superiority of the old commercial State is such, that, on an open trial of strength, it must at once prove fatal to its younger rivals. As this effect is thus the result of permanent causes affecting both sides, it may fairly be presumed that it will be lasting; and that the more anxiously the old manufacturing State advocates or acts upon freedom of commercial intercourse, the more strenuously will the younger and rising ones advocate protection. Reciprocity, therefore, is out of the question between them: for it never could exist without the destruction of the manufactures of the younger State; and if that State has begun to enter on the path of manufacturing industry, it never will be permitted by its Government."

The prodigious wealth that England has attained from the development of manufacturing industry, is the source of that power which has made her the first nation of the globe. Napoleon saw this, and, by his continental system, endeavored to exclude her manufactures from the coasts of Europe. In spite of the line of armed sentinels that guarded every harbor from the Neva to the Tagus, and from the Tagus to the Adriatic—in spite of confiscation, imprisonment, and death, such was the superiority of England in manufactures and the arts, and the dependance of Europe upon her for the most necessary fabrics, that British goods found an entrance into the closed ports of Europe, and penetrated into the French capital itself, as well as across the Alps into the plains of Italy.

Unless he could destroy the manufacturing prosperity of his relentless enemy, Napoleon saw that it was in vain to expect to hold subjugated Europe in chains—a power still existed which could feed and clothe the armies of the world. For this purpose, in conjunction with the continental system, he offered extravagant premiums and bounties to the successful inventors of machinery and new processes of the arts. He established the production of beet-root sugar in France to ruin the import of British sugars into Europe. Every new branch of industry, as it arose, was crushed beneath the overwhelming competition of England, who smuggled her goods into every European market, and undersold every rival trafficker. Napoleon, and the people of Europe, finally discovered that a system of domestic industry could not be forced into immediate existence like a hot-bed production, but that it required time and the hand of fostering legislation to bring it to maturity.

A striking instance, both of the impossibility of carrying the Berlin Decree into execution, and of the poverty of the continent in manufactures, is related by Bourrienne. Soon after the issue of that famous order in council, there arrived at Hamburg a thundering order for the immediate furnishing of 50,000 great coats, 200,000 pairs of shoes, 16,000 coats, 37,000 waistcoats, and other articles in proportion. The resources of the

Hanse Towns were wholly unequal to the supply of so great a requisition in so short a time; and after trying in vain every other expedient, Bourrienne, the French diplomatic agent, was obliged to contract with *English houses* for the supply, which soon arrived; and while the Emperor was denouncing the severest penalties against the possession of English goods, and boasting that by the continental system he had excluded British manufactures from the continent, his own army was clothed with the cloth of Leeds and Halifax, and his soldiers would have perished amid the snow of Prussic Eylau, but for the seasonable efforts of British industry.

With the vast resources that her manufacturing capital gave her, Great Britain, single handed, carried on the war against Napoleon. When the kingdoms of Europe had all sunk beneath the irresistible tide of victory that bore Napoleon to universal empire, England alone opposed a barrier to the accomplishment of his ambitious projects. Proud mistress of the seas, she swept the French flag from the ocean, and enjoyed the commerce of the whole world; from her inexhaustible treasury, she replenished the coffers of the impoverished nations of Europe; armed and equipped the peasant soldiery of Spain and Portugal; sustained the hosts of patriotic Germans who, in the secret meetings of the Tugenbunden, were preparing the overthrow of the iron-heeled despot, who had overthrown their government and laws, until she carried the flag of European redemption from the blood-stained sierras of Spain to the victorious field of Waterloo, where the armed hosts of Europe met and vanquished their common oppressor.

Was there no monitory voice speaking to us from the records of history against the ruinous tendencies of Free Trade, our intercourse with cotemporary nations would be sufficient, of itself, to teach us the utter impracticability of the universal prevalence of such a system. I have appealed to history to show the power that England has gained by the protection of her industry. I now refer to figures to show with what care she keeps the balance of trade on her side. The total value of exports and imports of Great Britain and Ireland, for three successive years, was as follows:

Year.	Exports.	Imports.
1839, - - - -	£110,198,716	£62,004,000
1840, - - - -	116,479,678	67,432,964
1841, - - - -	116,903,668	64,377,962
	<u>£343,582,062</u>	<u>£193,814,926</u>
	193,814,926	

Balance in favor of Great Britain, £149,767,136, or an annual average of £49,922,378, equal to \$237,227,414.

On the other hand, the amount of imports into the United States from foreign countries, for the nine years from 1831 to 1839, inclusive, exceeded the total amount of exports therefrom by the sum of \$235,278,695, as is shown by the following statement:

Year.	Imports.	Exports.
1831, - - - -	\$103,191,124	\$81,310,583
1832, - - - -	101,029,266	87,176,943
1833, - - - -	108,118,311	90,140,433
1834, - - - -	126,521,332	104,336,973
1835, - - - -	149,895,742	121,693,577
1836, - - - -	189,980,034	128,663,040
1837, - - - -	140,989,217	117,419,376
1838, - - - -	113,717,404	108,486,616
1839, - - - -	163,092,132	121,028,416
Total, - - - -	<u>\$1,195,534,562</u>	<u>\$960,255,957</u>
	960,255,957	

Balance against U. S. \$235,278,605

This heavy balance against the United States accounts for the depreciated currency, and for the indebtedness of corporations and States in the United States to the lords of Threadneedle street: hence has resulted the insolvency of banks and individuals, and the infamous doctrine of repudiation.

This same nation, which so zealously propagates the principles of Free Trade, and so earnestly reprobates them in her domestic policy, imposes almost prohibitory duties on our agricultural produce. The following duties are in the British Tariff on American products: Salted beef, 60 per cent.; bacon, 109 per cent.; butter, 70 per cent.; Indian corn, 32 per cent.; flour, 32 per cent.; rosin, 76 per cent.; sperm oil, 33 per cent.; sperm candles, 33 per cent.; tobacco, unmanufactured, 1,000 per cent.; tobacco,

manufactured, 1,200 per cent.; salted pork, 33 per cent.; soap, 200 per cent.; spirits from grain, 500 per cent.; spirits from molasses, 1,600 per cent. On these fourteen articles she imposes an average duty of 355 per cent. The same unjust policy to this country is seen in the differential duties of the British Tariff. By that tariff England imposes a duty of 14s. per cwt. upon bacon imported from the United States, while it is admitted at a duty of 3s. 6d. from her own provinces; beef is admitted on a duty of 4s. from her provinces, and taxed 16s. from the United States; American fisheries pay a duty of £15 per ton, the British 1s. per ton; our rice pays a duty of 6s. per cwt., rice from her provinces 6d. per cwt.; on oars from the United States she collects a duty of \$36 per 120, on the same from her provinces, a duty of 90 cents; on handspikes from the United States \$9 60 per 120, from her provinces 24 cents; on firewood from the United States \$2 40 per 216 cubic feet, from her provinces free. England admits no article but specie free of duty; and this is the consistent nation that is to be our exemplar and instructor in Free Trade!

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BRINKERHOFF) spoke of the hardship of the Tariff of 1842 upon the farming interest. That Tariff, sir, was framed for the protection of all interests. The agriculturalists share in its benefits as well as others. By the price current in January last, says the report of the Committee on Manufactures, the leading articles of agriculture, if imported, would pay a duty equal to an ad valorem, thus:

Cotton, duty 3 cents per pound—equal to 30 per cent. ad valorem.			
Wool, 30 per cent. and 3 cents per lb.	“	40	“
Beef, 2 cents per pound - - -	“	64	“
Pork, 2 cents “ - - -	“	34	“
Bacon, 3 cents “ - - -	“	52	“
Lard, 3 cents “ - - -	“	50	“
Cheese, 9 cents “ - - -	“	180	“
Butter, 5 cents “ - - -	“	51	“
Potatoes, 9 cents per bushel - - -	“	36	“
Flour, 122½ cents per barrel - - -	“	25	“
Wheat, 25 cents per bushel - - -	“	25	“
Oats, 10 cents per bushel - - -	“	33	“
Hemp, \$40 per ton - - -	“	30	“

On these thirteen articles, which comprise the great staples of agriculture, there is an average duty of 50 cent.

The importance of domestic manufactures to the farmer is proven in the fact, that fifteen-sixteenths of all the grain and potatoes raised in this country are consumed at home, and that only one-sixteenth is exported. Suppose, sir, the doctrines of Free Trade in full operation, and that we had no manufactures—the inevitable consequence of such a policy—where would the farmer find a market for his surplus produce? In England, where there is an average duty of 355 per cent. upon our agricultural produce? In Mexico and the Argentine Confederation, where the duties are prohibitory? In Chili, where the duties on our breadstuffs range from 25 to 50 per cent.? In Peru, with a duty of 30 per cent.? In Portugal, Russia, the Netherlands, and the two Sicilies, with prohibitory duties upon our agricultural products? There is not, sir, a port in the world which is not hermetically sealed against the importation of our breadstuffs, except in a time of scarcity, when they are necessary to feed a starving population. The farmer must look to the home market—to the four millions of persons engaged in manufactures—for the consumption of his products, and fair prices.

The iron manufacture alone will illustrate the importance of domestic industry to the farmer. Since the introduction of railroads, we have imported from Great Britain 360,000 tons of railroad iron. It is estimated by experienced ironmasters, that for each ton of bar iron the following agricultural produce is consumed:

20 bushels of Wheat and Rye,	average	75 cents per bushel,	\$ 15 00
57 pounds of Pork,	“	5 cents per pound,	2 85
43 pounds of Beef,	“	4 cents per pound,	1 72
10 pounds of Butter,	“	12½ cents per pound,	1 25
2 bushels of Potatoes,	“	30 cents per bushel,	60
½ ton of Hay,	“	\$7 30 per ton,	3 50
Vegetables, Fruit, &c.			
[Horses, &c. \$1 43.]			\$26 00

Multiply 560,000 tons by \$26, and we have the great sum of \$14,560,000 of the produce of the farm, which would have been expended here, had the Government been as liberal in its policy to the American manufacturer as to the British. In the iron works of Pennsylvania alone, there was consumed, in 1841, agricultural produce

to the value of \$5,788,987. The importance of a home market is seen in the increased value which agricultural lands and produce bear in the vicinity of a manufacturing town. The establishment of the mills at Lowell in 1820, gave great value to the rude and rugged country around that place. The site of Lowell, which, in 1820, cost a few thousands, is now worth several millions.

DEFENCE OF FACTORY LABORERS.

The gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. OWEN,) has dwelt much upon the distress and misery of the factory operatives in Great Britain. I do not mean to deny that there is much suffering among the laboring poor in England; it is not, however, one of the natural results of the manufacturing system. The corn laws, an expensive Government, and high taxation, are the causes of pauperism and poverty in England. Manufactures, by affording employment, alleviate the distress of those who would otherwise have no means of support. If the gentleman from Indiana intends to represent that there is more of the wretchedness of poverty, and more vice, among the manufacturing than the agricultural population of England, he is greatly mistaken. I appeal to the testimony of a distinguished author to refute this assertion.

"From a review of the population throughout England, it appears, "says Colquhoun, on Indigence, "that, contrary to the received opinion, the numbers of paupers in the counties which are chiefly agricultural, greatly exceed those where manufactures prevail! Thus, in Kent and Surry, where the aggregate population is 576,687, there appear to be 77,770 paupers, while, in Lancashire, where the population is 672,731, the paupers relieved is only 46,200."

In the three manufacturing counties of Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Stafford, the offenders are only one out of every 2,500; whereas, in the agricultural counties of Norfolk, Kent, and Surry, they are one out of 1,600; whereas, it appears that the latter districts have above half as many more criminals as the manufacturing, in proportion to their population. This is a strong and decisive fact.

In the three manufacturing counties, the paupers are only 8 per cent. of the population; whereas, in the agricultural, they are about 14 per cent. What becomes of the argument, then, of the gentleman? If so many of the factory operatives in England are rendered miserable by the manufacturing system, and if their condition is an evidence of the evil influences of that system, what shall be said of English agriculture, the statistics of which exhibit such an alarming preponderance in pauperism and crime over all other pursuits? Of course, the same state of things does not exist in this country, where the farming community is the most independent, comfortable, and virtuous portion of American society.

The alleged unhealthiness of factory employment, upon which the gentleman has dwelt at large, is just as fallacious as the demoralization of which he has drawn so dark a picture. In the report of the Commission to inquire into the condition of factory laborers, submitted to Parliament in 1843, there is an overwhelming mass of testimony in refutation of the unhealthiness of factory labor.

"In conclusion, then, it is proved by a preponderance of seventy-two witnesses against seventeen, that the health of those employed in cotton mills is nowise inferior to that in other occupations—and, secondly, it is proved by tables drawn up by the secretary of a sick club, and by the more extensive tables of a London Actuary, that the health of the factory population is decidedly *superior* to that of the laboring poor otherwise employed."—*Analysis of the Factory Report*, p. 16.

"The general tenor of all the medical reports in my possession, confirms Mr. Harrison's view of the effect of factory labor on the health of the younger branches of working hands. It is decidedly not injurious to health or longevity, compared with other employments."—*Reports of Inspectors of Factories*, August, 1834.

"It is gratifying to be able to state, that I have not a single complaint laid before me, either on the part of the masters against their servants, or of the servants against their masters; nor have I seen or heard of any instance of ill-treatment of children, or of injury to their health by their employment."—*Report of L. Horner, Esq.*, 2d July, 1834. p. 10.

"Not many would be employed, because there are few mill-owners who wish to have them before ten years of age; but in some branches of the cotton trade they would be employed at eight, or even younger; and as their occupation in the mills is so light as to cause no bodily fatigue, they would pass their eight hours there as beneficially for their health as at home; indeed, in most cases, far more so. Although they would get little, that little would be an object to many poor families."—*Ibid*, July 21, 1834, page 10.

"Mr. Saunders says—'It appears in evidence, that, of all employments to which children are subjected, those carried on in factories are amongst the least laborious, and, of all departments of in-door labor, amongst the least unwholesome.'"—*Report I*, page 51.

"It appears, moreover, that, as far as could be ascertained, the state of education among the factory operatives, though far from what it ought to be, was, to say the least, less deplorable than that of

rural districts, and of other classes in towns; that great efforts had been made by many of the largest manufacturers for the intellectual and moral improvement of their work-people; and that, 'as to the immorality said to be engendered by the factory system, the whole current of testimony goes to show that the charges made against cotton factories on this head are calumnies.' "—*Report, Sup. p. 201.*

THE AMERICAN LABORER.

The error of the gentleman lies in applying the condition of tax-oppressed and over-populated England to other countries widely different from it in natural resources, extent of territory, and institutions of Government. In England wages are low from the superabundance of labor, while rent and breadstuffs are high from the heavy taxation on real estate for the support of an expensive Throne, and from the corn laws, which enable the English landholder to sell his own products at the highest rates, by excluding those of other nations. In this country, an entirely different state of things exists. Instead of a surplus of labor, or an over-crowded population, we have a vast extent of country thinly peopled—with tracts of virgin soil yet unbroken by the plough, and inviting the hand of cultivation—a noble expanse of habitable and tillable land, extending from the Mississippi to the Pacific, where comfort, independence, and prosperity may be enjoyed by the poverty-stricken denizen of the great cities.

Here, agriculture and manufactures are rival bidders for labor. There is no surplus of labor, as in England, which obliges the operative to accept of such wages as the employer may offer. The laborer is sought after, and, from the competition for his services, he is always sure of such a rate of wages as may enable him to support his family, and to provide for the reverses of life and the infirmities of age. Moreover, if no employment can be had in manufactures, the unsettled lands of the West offer an opportunity for the acquisition of domestic and pecuniary ease, such as no other country presents.

In England, the man of humble means has no participation in the affairs of Government. He cannot rise to posts of honor in the Kingdom, from his inability to compete with the favored sons of fortune. The control of the Government is vested in the wealthier classes, who administer it more for their own benefit than that of the productive classes. An odious property qualification excludes a large proportion of the poor from the ballot-box. Here, we are all equal at the ballot-box, and the poorest citizen in the community has a voice in the control of public affairs and public men, as omnipotent as that of the wealthiest. The distribution of the right of suffrage, sir, in this country, and the influence it gives to the productive classes over the policy and operations of Government, is one reason why the American mechanic and operative occupies a higher position than in England. The workingmen and farmers have the destiny of the American Government in their keeping—they constitute the vast majority whose opinions and interests direct its movements and prescribe its policy—and it is to them we are indebted for the exhibition of all those beneficial influences which have made it an exemplar of political liberty for the whole civilized world.

Labor is spoken of, on this floor, as if it tended to mental and physical degradation. We are urged not to encourage manufactures, as, according to the opinion of some gentlemen, they brutalize and deteriorate the operative. I do not know, sir, whence gentlemen draw their opinions of labor. For my part, I know no distinction between the American mechanics and operatives and any other class of citizens. Some of the most eminent and useful men that this country has produced, rose to distinction from mechanical pursuits. Franklin left his printing press to chain the lightning of the heavens, to form a Constitution for a nation, and to represent his country in foreign Courts. Roger Sherman, the shoemaker, was an eloquent advocate of Independence in the Congress of the Revolution, and a statesman of great ability. Nathaniel Greene, the blacksmith, became a General in the Revolution, under whose gallantry, skill, and courage, some of the most glorious battles of that glorious era were achieved. Were these men less respectable, less worthy, less honorable, because they had commenced life at the forge, the press, and the last? Had labor degraded them, and so brutalized their minds as to lead them to prefer an ignominious slavery to a war for liberty and right? No, sir; they were patriots, self-sacrificing men, who perilled every thing for the attainment of a great end—the independence of their country. The first rally for independence in the Revolution was made among the farmers and mechanics. It was the hard hand of labor, the iron muscle and sinewy arm and the stalwart frame of the robust sons of industry, that first displayed the flag of national redemption, and first bore the arms of righteous resistance against the hireling soldier of British tyranny. In moral worth, intelligence, and information, the mechanics and operatives of this coun-

try have no superiors among any portion of our population. I throw back these imputations upon labor, and I defy gentlemen to prove their charges.

It is not the Protective System which is the enemy of the workingman, or I should not be its advocate. It is Free Trade, which repeals all protective duties, and forces us into hopeless competition with the pauper labor of Europe, that is the worst enemy of the American laborer. The price of European labor forbids all chance of competition with it, on our part, unless we are prepared to reduce a portion of our fellow-citizens to the same condition as the famished operatives of Birmingham and Manchester. Abolish the duties which protect American industry—remove all restrictions upon foreign imports—and how can manufactures thrive in this country unless, as the Free Traders insist, the wages of labor be reduced? What is the standard of wages in England? The following table, from a report to Parliament in 1840, shows the rate of wages in that country:

Average prices per week of the hand-loom weavers in Europe, including the weavers of silk, cotton, linen, and woollen, in all their varieties, exclusive of board.

Great Britain,	8s.	0d.	per week.	Belgium,	6s.	0d.	per week.
France,	7	0	"	Austria,	3	0	"
Switzerland,	5	7	"	Saxony,	2	1	"

These are the average prices given for adult male laborers; female being from 30 to 80 per cent. less.

Do the advocates of Free Trade wish to reduce the wages of the American laborer to the English standard of a shilling a day? Such is the effect of the practical operation of their doctrines. Pauperism and crime are inseparable concomitants of Free Trade: its supremacy in this country would be prolific of national and individual wretchedness. High wages are the fruit of the Protective System. In 1816, the same labor which was obtained at fifty cents a day, now commands \$1.50 to \$2.50, while the prices of clothing stuffs and domestic wares have receded with the continuance of protection, and the progress of manufactures. The fact that protection stimulates production and excites a spirit of active competition, ought of itself to lead to the conclusion, that, under its operations, prices must fall, while the application of steam and improvements in machinery, and the facility of water-power in this country, do away with any plea for a reduction of wages. In my view, that is sound policy which levies just such duties as, while they are sufficient to sustain the domestic manufacture, reduce its price to the consumer by bringing it into competition with the foreign article, the duty not being too high to exclude it. I refer to a few articles illustrative of the effects of protection, and to show how, under this policy, the price of every thing has been raised according to the theories of the Free Traders!

In 1815, cotton shirtings cost 20 cents per yard—now, 5 to 6 cents.

Before 1824, negro cloths were from 75 cents to \$1 per yard—now, 20 cents.

In 1819, Muscovado sugar was 16 cents per pound—now, 5 to 6 cents; refined sugar from 16 to 30 cents—now, 10 to 13 cents.

In 1815, cut nails were 15 cents per pound—now, 4½ or 5, notwithstanding a duty of 50 per cent., which ought to have advanced the price 50 per cent., according to Free Trade theories.

Just before the Tariff of 1824, bagging sold at 35 cents a yard; in 1827, at 27 cents; in 1828, at 24 cents. It is now worth 14 to 15 cents.

In 1822, sole leather was worth from 25 to 30 cents a pound. It is now worth 18¼.

In 1826, white lead was \$13 a hundred weight. It is now less than \$7.

Gunpowder was then 45 cents a pound. Protection created Dupont's mills, and his best keg powder is now worth 19 cents.

Shot was then 10 cents a pound. It is now 5½ cents.

Refined saltpetre was then over 10 cents a pound. It is now worth 8 cents.

Copperas was then 6 cents a pound. It is now 2½ cents.

Window-glass cost \$15 a hundred feet. It is now \$4. Yet the duty laid in 1832 was from \$3 to \$4 a hundred feet, which immediately brought the price down to \$5. Four millions of dollars' worth of glass is now manufactured.

The heavy manufactures of iron have averaged, in value, since 1824, about forty millions of dollars annually; and, since the tariff of 1828, the reduction of price has been at least 20 per cent., or eight millions a year.

\$750,000 worth of metal buttons are manufactured per annum, and the price is reduced more than one-half.

\$100,000 worth of pins, and about the same reduction in price.

\$1,750,000 worth of brushes—better than are made in the world—and at one-third their former cost.

Hats of the quality which formerly sold at \$2.50, now sell for \$1, and those that formerly sold at \$10 now sell at \$5.

Salt, during the war, was \$4 a bushel. Now seven millions of bushels are made in the country, and it is worth only 26 cents a bushel, being the lowest price.

Floor oilcloths formerly cost from \$2 to \$2.50 a yard. They can now be bought of better quality at \$1.25.

The value of manufactured paper and paper articles is over five millions per annum, at one-half the former prices.

The above, both *former* and *present*, are *Eastern* prices.

I shall not, Mr. Speaker, discuss the constitutionality of protective duties. It is sufficient for me to know, that, in the debates in the Convention to form the Constitution, the power of the Government to protect American industry was affirmed by Mr. Madison, and admitted by all the leading members of that body—that the necessity of protecting our native manufactures by adequate duties has been recommended by every President of the United States, from George Washington to Andrew Jackson—and that it had received the approval of Henry Clay, whose unyielding devotion to every thing American will be held in lasting remembrance ;

“ Like an oak of healthiest bough,
Deep-rooted in his country’s love, he stands ;”

of John C. Calhoun, and every leading statesman who has preferred the practical good of his country to the abstract theories of speculative philosophers. I shall not further discuss the protective policy. Every great national interest is concerned in its existence. Agriculture, manufactures, the mechanical arts, all classes and occupations, derive benefits from it, while it is the true source of national wealth, power, and independence. It is the true *American* policy—that policy which, in peace and war, keeps the hosts of American laborers employed, and the millions of American citizens prosperous and happy. It is the policy of the founders of the Republic—of Washington, Hamilton, and Madison ; and it will exist as long as there is an American heart that glows with love of home and country and kindred.

The nation is now flourishing—business is reviving—the balance of trade is largely in our favor—specie is flowing into the country—the currency is improving—and plenty, comfort, and prosperity are in all our borders. The country needs repose and stability of legislation. I shall stand by the measure which has produced all these benefits—I shall take my position with the business men, the workingmen, and the farmers, in favor of the Tariff of 1842, and shall steadily and resolutely resist its repeal. It is time that this vacillating and ever-changing legislation should cease, and that we should give the country assurance of a disposition to uphold it in the prosecution of those branches of industry to which the acts of our predecessors have invited the investment of capital and the application of labor. I, for one, will never consent to sacrifice the industry of the nation to schemes of party arrangement and expediency, or to the doctrines of that school of political economy which regards communities and nations as mere subjects of experiment for charlatans in philosophy and politics.

NOTE I.

FREE TRADE.—The opposers of a Protective Tariff profess to be in favor of *Free Trade*. As there is something pleasing in the idea of Free Trade, let us see what it involves. In the first place, it requires that all duties whatever should be repealed, and that the public treasury should be supplied by some other means. And how can the wants of the Government be supplied? The proceeds of the sales of the public lands, which ought in justice to be distributed among the States, could supply but a small portion of the necessary revenue, if it were paid into the treasury. The doctrine of Free Trade, then, necessarily implies *direct taxation* ; and are the people prepared for this? It is admitted by those conversant with the subject, that direct taxation would bear more oppressively upon the people than indirect. In the first place, the cost of collection would be greater, as a host of new officers must be created for that purpose. Let us look at its operation upon the States.

During the administration of Mr. Van Buren, the aggregate expenditures, as shown by the Secretary’s report, amounted to \$133,411,853, being an average annual expenditure of \$33,352,963. The cost of assessing and collecting is much greater in the case of direct taxes than in the present mode ; there would also be a much greater liability to losses than in the present system. To realize a sum equal to the above average, you would be compelled to add to that sum \$2,650,000, making, in round numbers, \$36,000,000 to be assessed upon the people. By a provision of the Constitution, all direct taxes must be apportioned among the several States according to federal numbers. This, with the size of the present House of Representatives, would amount to \$161,435 to each Representative. If we were to

take the number of Representatives from each State as the basis of her federal numbers, which would be near enough for our present purpose, the tax would fall upon the several States as follows :

Maine	\$1,130,045	Delaware	\$161,435	Tennessee	\$1,775,785
New Hampshire	645,740	Maryland	968,710	Kentucky	1,614,350
Vermont	645,740	Virginia	2,421,525	Ohio	3,390,135
Massachusetts	1,614,350	North Carolina	1,452,915	Indiana	1,614,350
Rhode Island	322,870	South Carolina	1,130,045	Illinois	1,130,045
Connecticut	645,740	Georgia	1,291,480	Missouri	807,175
New York	5,488,790	Alabama	1,130,045	Arkansas	161,435
New Jersey	807,175	Mississippi	645,740	Michigan	484,306
Pennsylvania	3,874,440	Louisiana	645,740		

Let the Tariff of duties be repealed, and the wants of the Government be supplied by a direct tax upon the people, and the glories of Free Trade would not only be seen, but *felt*. The wand of the magician could hardly reconcile the Empire State to the annual tax of \$5,488,000. Let Pennsylvania be called upon to contribute \$3,874,000, from year to year, and she would crave the pardoning power of Governor Porter in good earnest. Subject Virginia to the annual payment of \$2,421,000, and she would feel that Free Trade was something more than an abstraction. Before South Carolina had paid her quota (\$1,130,000) five years, she would call in nullification to her aid, and ask for a dissolution of the Union. The fact is, the indebted States could not, at the present time, meet such exactions. The Free Trade men of Indiana, and Illinois, and Mississippi, and Michigan, and Maryland, and some other States, who now complain so bitterly of the burdens of the Tariff, would, under the system of direct taxation, soon learn that they had deceived themselves by wild theories, and would wish to return to the sober realities of a tried system. But if men will not learn wisdom, except by bitter experience, let Free Trade come, and direct taxation follow in its train. Let the people suffer, if they must, until they learn that the tried path of our patriot fathers is not to be abandoned to promote the interest of foreign importers.—*Tariff Doctrine*.

NOTE II.

LOWELL AND ITS FACTORIES.—This town, which is a creation of the Protective System, having grown up from a mere hamlet in 1820, to a city of 25,000 in 1840, is thus described by the editor of the *New York Tribune* :

There are eleven regular manufacturing companies in Lowell, including the "Locks and Canals," or Water-privilege Company, which was incorporated in 1792, but did not commence operations till 1822, which may be regarded as the year of the foundation of Lowell. Before that time, it was a rugged, rocky, barren spot, inhabited by two or three families of boatmen and fishermen, and not worth ten dollars per acre, including every thing upon it. The Merrimac Company commenced business the next year, and no other until the Tariff of 1824 was passed. In 1825, the Hamilton Company was started; in 1828, the Appleton and Lowell; in 1830, the Middlesex; in 1832, the Suffolk and Tremont; in 1833, the Lawrence; in 1836, the Boott; in 1840, the Massachusetts, being the last. These eleven companies employ an aggregate capital of \$10,700,000, employing 6,295 females and 2,345 males. Besides these, there are in Lowell extensive powder mills, a flannel mill, blanket mill, bolting mill, foundry, paper mill, bleachery, cord and whip factory, planing machine, reed machine, grist and saw mills, employing a capital of \$500,000 and 500 workmen, making the whole manufacturing capital of Lowell \$11,200,000, employing over 9,000 men and women.

The ten principal manufactories already designated have thirty-three mills, besides print-works, run 6,194 looms and 281,076 spindles, producing 1,425,800 yards of cloth per week, or 74,141,600 within the year 1843. The cotton fabricated by them during the year was 22,880,000 pounds. (A pound of cotton will average 3 1-5 yards of cloth; 100 lbs. of cotton will make 89 lbs. of cloth. A loom will average on No. 14 yarn 44 yards of cloth per day, or on No. 30, 30 yards.) Of printed cloths, 273,000 yards per week are made by the Merrimac and Hamilton Companies. The Middlesex makes 9,000 yards of cassimeres and 1,800 yards of broadcloths per week, using 1,000,000 pounds of wool and 3,000,000 pounds of teasels per annum. The Lowell makes 2,500 yards of carpets and 150 of rugs per week, besides 85,000 yards of cottons. Flannels are made at the Hamilton, sheetings and shirtings at nearly all, with drillings, printing cloths, &c. at several.

The average wages paid to the females, young and old, experienced and inexperienced, is \$1.75 per week beyond the cost of board; to males, \$4.20 per week, or about \$18 per month beyond the cost of their board. The payments are all made in cash, amounting to \$150,000 per month. We challenge the wide world to produce, out of the manufacturing districts of our own country, a region wherein female labor is so bounteously employed and is paid an average of \$7.50 per month beyond the cost of board. And we challenge this or any other country to produce a section in which women who work for their living are more intelligent, better educated, more virtuous, religious, and independent, than those employed in the Lowell manufactories. There have been most shameful slanders circulated with regard to them which ought to be put down. In the infancy of these establishments some females of bad character obtained employment there, through deception, but these were speedily detected and expelled; and now, if one of bad character is discovered there, she is required to leave directly, as the others will not endure the association of vice. No where is there a more correct and vigorous moral sentiment, than among these industrious and independent women.

As to the alleged hardship of factory labor, we have no doubt that its conditions might be improved. We believe the average hours of labor are 12½ per day, which is too much for an employment which is pursued the year round. It does not allow time enough for reading, study, attending lectures, and other means of moral and intellectual improvement. But, on the other hand, it must be considered that the labor is very light; that many pursue it for hours together with an open book before them, reading

half the time; and that all greatly prefer it to any other field of industry. You can hardly induce an American girl at the eastward to do housework, except for her own family or for the sick; the large majority would prefer working in a factory for \$1.50 per week, to doing housework for \$2. And the establishment of manufactories has, to our certain knowledge, more than doubled the average recompense accorded to female labor throughout the manufacturing region, while greatly reducing the price of almost every thing a woman buys. Besides this, the treatment of females who do housework has greatly improved since the factories were started. No woman of sense or spirit will now submit to the humiliations which were common there twenty years ago, (and which are common here now,) because she knows where she may at any time go to avoid them.

It is common enough for our Free Trade traders to talk flippantly of our females engaged in factories, as if they were of like character and condition with those of England. But this is very unlike the truth. The American factory girl is generally the daughter of a farmer, has had a common education at the district school, and has gone into the factory for a few seasons to acquire a little something for a start in life. She spends some weeks or months of every year under her father's roof, and generally marries and settles in its vicinity. Many attend lectures and evening schools after the day's work is over, and of the six thousand, more than half regularly occupy and pay for seats in the numerous churches at Lowell. Nowhere is the Sabbath better observed, or the proportion of habitual church-goers greater than in that thriving city; hardly anywhere is temperance more general, or are violations of the law less frequent. Six out of ten of the females, and a full half of the males, enjoy better health in the mills than they did before coming there.

Six of the mills are warmed by steam, only two by hot air, and three by steam and hot air together. The annual consumption of wood there, is 3,290 cords; of anthracite coal, 12,500 tons; of oil, 67,856 gallons. 600,000 bushels of charcoal were used in 1843, and 4,000 barrels of flour for starch alone. The Locks and Canals Company use 1,225 tons of iron per annum; will put up and furnish a factory of 5,000 spindles complete in four months, and employs, when building, 1,000 to 1,200 workmen.

Such are some of the statistics of the chief manufacturing town in America. As a specimen of regulated, systemized, well-directed industry, it is worthy of study. Though doubtless far enough from perfection, whether as to efficiency or distribution of proceeds, we ask every friend of the human race to judge whether it is wise or humane to favor a policy which would diminish such towns as Lowell, and enlarge such as Manchester, Preston, and Glasgow. This is the practical question. And while the laborers of England have, under all changes of policy, been yearly sinking into deeper and deeper abjectness and despair, owing to causes far beyond the reach of any policy we may pursue, we rejoice in being able to state that the workingmen and women of Lowell have very large and general deposits in the Savings' Bank of that place, and that they are becoming large owners of stocks in the corporation for which they work—in one already to the extent of \$100,000, in another to the amount of \$60,000, &c. Here is the germ of the true and general reform which we hope to see become universal, and which, when it shall have resulted in making the workmen large and general owners of stock in the establishment in which they are employed, sharing fairly in their profits, will put an effectual stop to the demagogue resort of exciting laborers against employers, to the injury and ruin of both.

One word on the *profits* of manufacturing, and we close. The very Free Trade journals which moralized with ill-concealed exultation over the reported failures of the Saugerties Iron Works, of Senator Sprague's Calico Works, &c., as showing the delusiveness of Protection and of the hopes of benefit to manufactures from the Tariff, since have made the land ring with their proclamations, that the manufactures, under the Protection Tariff, are making profits of 20 to 40 per cent. ! The excuse for this falsehood is the alleged fact that the Merrimac, at Lowell, and one or two other companies, have made heavy dividends this year. Now, the Merrimac is the oldest establishment at Lowell, with extensive and valuable connections, is engaged in printing calicoes, (the same business which Senator Sprague failed in this year,) having a capital of two millions of dollars, and thus able to supply the market when it is favorable, and withhold its goods when otherwise, just as the Harpers' make money by publishing when younger and weaker houses go down all around them. Calico printing is either a good or very bad business; the Merrimack Company have this year, and usually make it, a good one. But the average dividends of the Lowell Companies have not been seven per cent. this year, nor averaged five per cent. since they were established, probably not four. We have read over the list of dividends received by one of the heaviest owners of manufacturing stocks in Boston, whose investments have been made wisely and well; and his dividends do not average seven per cent. this year, while for the three preceding they fell below five. There are very few who have done better, while many have fared worse than he. But it is useless to dwell further on this branch of the subject.